Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program (SMBNEP) Governance Review eSurvey

Background

Under US EPA National Estuary Program Guidance, the structure of governance for the Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program (SMBNEP), the "Management Conference," is required to be periodically reviewed. In June and December 2018, staff of <u>US EPA and SMBNEP presented background on the structure of the SMBNEP and its component elements. This included the staff of US EPA, the staff of the Bay Foundation, and staff of the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission.</u>

In December 2018, the <u>SMBRC</u> Governing Board held a board workshop in order for the Board to provide input on the current governance and any suggestions for changes and modifications to the overall governance structure, or to any of the specific elements of the governance structure, or any policies and practices. <u>SMBRC's Executive Committee and Watershed Advisory Council held similar workshops in January 2019. Members of these entities were also encouraged to provide their input by completing a preliminary questionnaire.</u>

The Bay Foundation, in cooperation with the Bay Commission, developed Ithis eSurvey was developed based on initial input received from the workshop and completed questionnaires, as an opportunity for all members of the Management Conference, interested stakeholders, and members of the public_-to provide more focused and qualified input on specific elements of the governance of the SMBNEP's governance s_ and any suggestions for changes and modifications to the overall governance structure, or to any of the specific elements of the governance structure, or any policies and practices.

We are particularly interested to know your thoughts on what's working well, if and how current governance could be improved, and any specific suggested changes or modifications to any elements of the Management Conference which including the GB, EC, TAC, WAC, TBF, and SMBRA) and the relationship of these committees to TBF. See attached table and chart for reference), or changes or modifications to any governance practices or policies of the SMBNEP that can contribute to improved performance and achievement of Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan objectives for protecting, conserving, enhancing, and restoring Santa Monica Bay and its watersheds.

Commented [WG1]: Suggest to name all entities of the MCA here and attach the MC table and diagram from the last questionnaire to this survey. Because this survey is open to all interested stakeholders, we must anticipate that there are still people who do not know what the MC is composed of.

Q1. We would describe our organization agency's attendance at SMBNEP public meetings a	s:	
--	----	--

Always Attend	Regularly	Sometimes	Have in Past	Never have

Q2. We would describe our <u>organization</u> agency's participation in the activities of the SMBNEP as:

Fully Active	Active	Sometimes	Inactive	Not Active

Q3. Our <u>organizationagency</u>'s primary reasons for attending and participating in the SMBNEP are:

Availability of Technical, Policy, and Project Expertise	
Ability to Partner on Grant Funding and Projects	
Assistance in Delivery of Regional Projects/Initiatives	
Assistance with Individual project implementation	
Other:	

Q 4. How well informed are you regarding the structure and functions of the current SMBNEP Management Conference governance?

Fully	A Lot	More than a Little	A little	Not at all

Q 5. Effectiveness of Management Conference

Please rate the effectiveness of current Management Conference governance structure in meeting SMBNEP/ CCMP priorities

	Fully Effective	Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	Don't Know-Need More Information
Overall						
Developing						
and Managing						
Projects						
Making Policy						
Raising and						
Expending						
Funds						
Researching						
and						
Monitoring						
Bay Conditions						
Educating and						
Engaging						
Stakeholders						

Q 6. Effectiveness of Governing Board/Executive Committee

Please rate the effectiveness of current GB/EC governance structure in meeting SMBNEP/CCMP priorities.

	Fully Effective	Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat	Not Effective	Don't Know-Need
				Effective		More Information
Overall						

Developing			
and Managing			
Projects			
Making Policy			
Raising and			
Expending			
Funds			
Researching			
and			
Monitoring			
Bay Conditions			
Educating and			
Engaging			
Stakeholders			

Q 7. Effectiveness of the Watershed Advisory Committee (WAC)

Please rate the effectiveness of current WAC governance structure in meeting SMBNEP/CCMP priorities.

	Fully Effective	Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	Don't Know-Need More Information
Overall				Lincottic		Wiere inversion
Informing and						
Affecting						
Projects						
Informing and						
Affecting						
Policy						
Informing and						
Affecting						
Program and						
Project						
Funding						
Understanding						
Research on						
and						
Monitoring of						
Bay Conditions						
Educating and						
Engaging						
Stakeholders						

Q 8. Effectiveness of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Please rate the effectiveness of current TAC governance structure in meeting SMBNEP/CCMP priorities.

	Fully Effective	Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	Don't Know-Need More Information
Overall						
Informing and						
Affecting						
Projects						
Informing and						
Affecting						
Policy						
Researching						
and						
Monitoring						
Bay Conditions						
Informing and						
Educating						
Stakeholders						

Q 9. Effectiveness of The Bay Foundation

Please rate the effectiveness of the Bay Foundation governance structure in meeting SMBNEP/CCMP priorities.

	Fully Effective	Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	Don't Know-Need More Information
Overall						
Developing						
and Managing						
Projects						
Informing and						
Affecting						
Policy						
Raising and						
Expending						
Funds						
Supporting,						
Funding, and						
Managing						
Research and						
Monitoring of						
Bay Conditions						
Educating and						
Engaging						
Stakeholders						

	Fully Effective	Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	Don't Know-Need More Information	
Overall				Lirective		Work mornation	
Managing Projects							
Raising and Expending							
, .						1	
Funds	tive is the current g	overnance relation	ship of the US	EPA NEP Program	with The Bay Found	ation and SMBRC?	
Funds	tive is the current g		ship of the US More than a L		-	ation and SMBRC?	Commented [WG2]: Suggest also adding a "Don't Know" column
Funds Q 11. How effec	A Lot		More than a L	ittle A little	-	Not at all	

eSurvey

Q 10. Effectiveness of Bay Restoration Authority (SMBRA)

SMBNEP

1-28-19

O	13. How	effective	is the current	governance	relationship	between	the SMBRC	and The Ba	y Foundation?

Fully	A Lot	More than a Little	A little	Not at all	

 $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Commented [WG4]: Save as above. Adding a "Don't Know" Column.} \end{array} \\$

4. What do you see as	the unique strengths and	attributes of the SMB	NEP Management Co	nference governance stru	icture?
15. Are there governan	ce policies and practices tl	hat best contribute to	achieving the SMBNE	P's goals and objectives?	

Q 16. Are there elements of the current governance structure that could be modified for improved performance?

	Keep as Is	Modify Structure	Modify Policies	Modify Practices
Governing Board-				
Executive Committee				
WAC				

TAC				
The Bay Foundation				
The Bay Restoration				
Authority_(SM8RA)				
Please explain:				
Q 17. Do you feel there are major go	vernance obstacles/challenge	s to achieving program	success?	
Please explain:				
Q 18. Are there new or modified gov achievement of the SMBNEP's goals		s that could be impleme	nted that could lead to b	etter

eSurvey

SMBNEP

ED_002622_00000201-00011

1-28-19

Fully	A Lot	More than a Little	A little	Not at all	
omments:					
20. Could you	suggest any other changes	to the current governance struct	ure or suggestions fo	r future governance?	
21. Financing/	Implementation/Communit	ty Private/Public Partnerships			
		•			

Commented [WG5]: This question seems to duplicative of Q5 and redundant after asking other questions above (especially Q17). Suggest to delete.

Commented [TF6R5]: Getting rid of Q17 works for me

	ew or expanded governance, finan veloping?	cing, and implementation p	partnerships should th	e Management Conferer	nce be exploring
	How active would you like to be in	the SMBNEP going forward			
Q ==:	Very	the switch going for war			
	Moderately	MARKAL MARKAL MARKAL MARKAL MARKAL			
	Slightly				
	Very Little				
	None at all				
	e SMBNEP?)				
Q 24. C	Other Comments:				

eSurvey

SMBNEP

1-28-19

Optional:			
Optional: Name:		 	
Organization:			